

REMARKS

Claims 47 to 51 are in the application and, pursuant to the Office Action, stand finally rejected under 35 USC §102(b) over the cited prior art with claim 47 being rejected as anticipated by **Humphrey et al.** and claims 47 to 51 being rejected as anticipated by **Van Ooy**. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejections of claims in this application in view of this Amendment wherein the rejected claims are canceled and replaced by new claims 52 to 57 which better define the invention and more clearly distinguish it over the cited references.

Specifically, the present invention is directed to a work holder suitable for use in surface treating work; *i.e.* that which is illustrated in Figs. 5 to 7 of the drawings and particularly described in Section III of the specification entitled, "Embodiment of surface-treating holder," that bridges pages 22 and 23 of the specification. Furthermore, revisions are made hereof to the relevant portion of the specification in order to cure language defects that resulted from translating the original description of the invention from Japanese to English whereby a clearer and more understandable description of the invention is obtained.

Thus, as broadly recited in new claim 52, the present invention involves a work holder construction which is substantially tubular in shape and is formed of a continuous coiled wire 11 having spirally wound turns 12a at opposite ends of the body to define faces 12 forming holder end closures, and an intermediate portion 13 having turns disposed on mutual spacing for retaining work within the holder.

The remaining claims each depend from claim 52 wherein claim 53 requires that the tubular body be generally cylindrical; claim 54 recites the inclusion of means such as a small diameter coiled spring 14 wound around turns of the tubular body for preventing entanglement of the work holder with an adjacent work holder; claim 55 defines, as entanglement-preventing means, a construction wherein the portion adjacent each opposite end of the intermediate portion of the body is defined by a plurality of turns 13a that have substantially no clearance therebetween; claim 56 specifies that the coil portions defining the respective end closures of the body include turns 12a in the central region which are more closely wound; and, finally, claim 57 requires that the wire be a stainless steel wire.

Clearly, neither of the references cited in the Office Action either suggest or teach the present invention. The work holder of **Humphrey et al.**, contrary to comprising a coiled wire construction as required by claim 52, is simply a work holder construction having multiple cells formed by radially extending plates. The patent to **Van Ooy**, on the other hand, is clearly non-analogous to the claimed invention in that it discloses, not a work holder, but, instead, a shock absorber.

For the foregoing reasons it is submitted that the claims now in the application clearly distinguish over the cited references and should be allowed. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner enter this Amendment in the case and pass the application to issue. In the event the Examiner is constrained to retain the rejection of claims in the application it is requested that the Examiner nonetheless cancel claims 47 to 51 and enter the amendments to the specification and the new claims 52 to 57 herein in order to place the application in better condition for appeal.

On the other hand, however, if the Examiner finds that minor revision is still required to render the claims in the application satisfactory, it is requested that he call the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below in order to expedite the changes required to place the application in condition for allowance.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS, HANSON & BROOKS, LLP



John F. Carney
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 20,276

JFC/lms

Atty. Docket No. **991074A**
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE